DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 809 SP 026 142

AUTHOR Pigge, Fred L.; Reed, Patricia L.
TITLE A Follow-up Study of Teachers' Needs, Proficiencies, and Sources of Proficiencies.
PUB DATE 31 Mar 85
NOTE 52p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (69th, Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Competence; Elementary Secondary Education; *Job Analysis; Job Performance; *Needs Assessment; Preservice Teacher Education; Rural Schools; Teaching (Occupation); *Teaching Experience; *Teaching Skills; Urban Schools; Vocational Followup

ABSTRACT

A total of 654 1976-1980 graduates of Bowling Green State University (Ohio) teaching in rural, urban, and suburban settings, representing elementary, secondary, specialized and special education fields, and having from one to five years of teaching experience comprised the sample for this study. Responses of these teachers to a 19-item questionnaire pertaining to teachers' needs, proficiencies and sources of proficiencies provided the data base from which the following questions were answered: (1) For which competencies do teachers indicate high need? high proficiency? low need? low proficiency? (2) For which competencies are there large, moderate, small, or negligible discrepancies between teachers' needs and proficiencies? (3) What are the relationships between teachers' needs and proficiencies? (4) Do these relationships vary according to setting? field? experience? (5) What sources do teachers indicate contribute most to their proficiency? the least? and (6) Do sources of teachers' proficiency vary by setting? field? experience? (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257809

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF TEACHERS' NEEDS, PROFICIENCIES, AND SOURCES OF PROFICIENCIES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Fred L. Pigge
and
Patricia L. Reed
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F.L. Pigge / P.L. Reed

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Paper Presented at the AERA Annual Convention
Chicago, Illinois
March 31, 1985
Session 3.11

SP026142

ABSTRACT

A total of 694 1976-80 graduates of Bowling Green State University teaching in rural, urban, and suburban settings, representing elementary, secondary, specialized and special education fields, and having from one to five years of teaching experience comprised the sample for this study. Responses of these teachers to two sections of a follow-up evaluative questionnaire pertaining to teachers' needs, proficiencies and sources of proficiencies for nineteen competency items provided the data base from which the following questions were answered:

1. For which competencies do teachers indicate high need? High proficiency? low need? low proficiency?

2. For which competencies are there large, moderate, small or negligible discrepancies between teachers' needs and proficiencies?

3 What are the relationships between teachers' needs and proficiencies?

4 Do these relationships vary according to setting? field? experience?

5. What sources do teachers indicate contribute most to their proficiency? the least?

6. Do sources of teachers' proficiency vary by setting? field? experience?

Outline of Paper

Section	Page
OVERVIEW	1
THE PROBLEM AREA	3
METHOD	3
Procedures and sample	3
Instrumentation	4
FINDINGS	5
Teachers' Needs and Proficiencies	5
Need for Each Competency	5
Proficiency in Each Competency	5
Discrepancies between Need and Proficiency	5
Comparisons by Teaching Setting	6
Comparisons by Teaching Field--Needs	6
Comparison by Teaching Field--Proficiencies	8
Comparisons by Teaching Experience--Needs	10
Comparisons by Teaching Experience--Proficiencies	10
Relationship between Need and Proficiency	11
Sources of Teachers' Proficiency	11
Computation of Average Ranks and Coefficients of Concordance	11
Sources of Teachers' Proficiencies	14
Comparisons of Sources by Setting	15
Comparisons of Sources by Field	15
Comparison of Sources by Experience	17
Comparisons by Need and Source	18
Summary	18
Level of Need and Proficiency	18
Discrepancies between Need and Proficiency	20
Relationship between Need and Proficiency	20
Comparisons by Setting, Field, and Experience	21
Sources of Teacher Proficiency	23
Comparisons of Sources by Setting, Field, and Experience	23
IMPLICATIONS	24
REFERENCES	26
Tables	
Table 1 The Classifications and Number of Teachers Within Each	28
Table 2 Means, Ranks, and Mean Discrepancies of the Teachers' Needs and Proficiencies (N=694)	29
Table 3 Analysis of Teachers' Needs and Proficiencies--By Teaching Setting, Field, and Experience	30
Table 4 Post-Hoc Pair-Wise Mean Comparisons (Scheffe @.05) Relating to Significant ANOVA F-Ratios	32
Table 5 Correlations between Teachers' Need and Proficiency Rankings by Teaching Field and Experience	33
Table 6 Analysis of the Sources of Teachers' Proficiencies--By Teaching Setting, Field, and Experience	34
Table 7 Summary of How All Teachers Ranked the Sources of Their Proficiencies	41

A Follow-up Study of Teachers' Needs, Proficiencies, and Sources of Proficiencies

OVERVIEW

Over the past several years, the gathering of the data from which to make judgements regarding the on-the-job performance of teacher education graduates has become a growing concern among many schools, colleges and departments of education. Currently, such efforts are viewed as an essential part of program evaluation in Standards for the Accredition of Teacher Education (National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1982). Furthermore, in Educating a Professional: Competency Assessment, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education issued a challenge to teacher education institutions to "assume the leadership role in the design and implementation of beginning teacher assessment programs" and give particular attention "to the teacher's professional skills and knowledge of subject matter" (1983, p. 5).

One impetus for collecting such information has been the recent widespread concern regarding the declining quality of teacher candidates and the questionable contribution of preservice professional education coursework. However, development of reliable and valid measures of the relationships between teacher education coursework or experience and teacher competency is a complex methodological problem (Medley, 1982). Even so, current teacher education program approval processes continue to be criticized because there is no standardized measure of the exit competencies of graduates (Feistritzer, 1984). Thus, more and more states now require or are considering the use of competency tests for the purpose of awarding certification (The Nation Responds, 1984; AACTE, 1985). At least one state, Florida, has even tied the testing of graduates directly to policies and procedures for approving college and universities to prepare teachers. Although others have not yet followed this route, there is a clear implication that graduates' scores on tests are coming to be viewed as a major indicator of program effectiveness.

Recognizing the limitations of tests in evaluating program effects and predicting teacher competency, educational researchers have recently directed greater attention to designing and implementing follow-up studies of graduates (Borich, 1979; Hord and Hall, 1979; Hord, Savage and Bethel, 1982; Queen and Gretes, 1982; Blair, 1983). Although such studies may not provide direct evidence of teacher competency, they can provide indications of the extent of congruence between program intents and outcomes.

However, there are also other benefits to be gained from follow-up studies. Findings can be used to generate new insights regarding the expectations and values which characterize the ongoing demands of the teacher's workplace ---

the school. They can assist teacher educators in understanding the types of problems for which future teachers may need to be prepared (Goodlad, 1984, pp. 183-186). Teachers' self-reports can illuminate the day-to-day demands associated with teaching. Teachers' perceptions of need are one means for determining the priorities which characterize schools and shape teachers' performance. Teachers' judgements of their own proficiency provide one measure of efficacy, that sense of potency which enables teachers to maintain a high task orientation on the part of students (Joyce, 1983; p. 29). Longitudinal studies of teacher education graduates can reveal change or lack of change over time in preparation programs as well as in practitioners and the contexts in which they teach.

Findings generated from teacher follow-up studies thus can serve four very important purposes. They can be used to identify: (1) variables that are most instrumental in determining the nature and extent of teachers' proficiency prior to and following their entry into teaching, (2) changes that may need to be made in the preparation of future teachers, (3) needs which exist in the ongoing professional development of practicing teachers and ultimately, (4) conditions which inhibit/enhance school effectiveness.

Despite these potential benefits many teacher education institutions as yet have no systematic procedures for examining the performance of their graduates. For example, at a recent national Conference on Student Assessment, only half of the participating institutions reported using follow-up studies as a means for determining program effects (Pre-Conference Reports, 1984). Also, across institutions, variables addressed and methodologies employed vary widely, thus precluding the formulation of generalizable conclusions.

One aim of this study, therefore, is to encourage the conduct of systematic, comprehensive assessments of teacher education graduates by illustrating how mail surveys can be employed to obtain data regarding the competency of teacher education graduates. It is important to note, however, that such surveys should be augmented by other procedures such as exit-level tests, on-site observations of graduates' on-the-job performance, and interviews with and data collection from teachers' peers, pupils and administrators. Also, reports presenting findings of these studies must provide specific recommendations and incentives for making program changes if improvement in the preservice and inservice preparation of teachers is to result (Katz, et.al., 1981).

A second aim is to demonstrate that follow-up studies can serve several purposes. Specifically the intent of the study is to identify relationships which may exist between teachers' needs and proficiencies and their preservice preparation, teaching setting, teaching field and teaching experience. Identification of such relationships is essential to determine not only changes that need to be made in the preparation of

future teachers but needs which exist in the on-the-job professional growth of practicing teachers.

THE PROBLEM AREA

The general objectives of this study are to:

1. Analyze and present findings of the relationships/differences between the teachers' perceived needs and proficiencies for 19 competency areas by comparing/contrasting (a) responses from teachers in different settings (rural, urban, suburban), (b) responses from teachers in 4 teaching fields (elementary, secondary, special education, and specialized), and (c) responses from teachers with varying years of experience (1 through 5).

2. Identify the primary sources of teachers' proficiencies.

3. Compare/contrast the sources of the teachers' noted proficiencies by (1) teaching setting, (2) teaching field, and (3) years of teaching experience.

The specific problems of this study are to answer the following questions:

1. For which competencies do teachers indicate high need? High proficiency? low need? low proficiency?

2. For which competencies are there large, moderate, small or negligible discrepancies between teachers' needs and proficiencies?

3. What are the relationships between teachers' needs and proficiencies?

4. Do these relationships vary according to setting? field? experience?

5. What sources do teachers indicate contribute most to their proficiency? the least?

6. Do sources of teachers' proficiency vary by setting? field? experience?

METHOD

PROCEDURES AND SAMPLE

To identify those individuals currently teaching in Ohio, in January of 1981, BGSU provided the Ohio Department of Education a listing of social security numbers of all its 1976 through August, 1980 education graduates. By matching these social security numbers with principals' fall reports (which

list the basic data of every teacher in each building) the State Department provided multiple sets of address labels for those 1976-80 graduates currently employed by Ohio schools. A fifty percent sample was drawn for the two teaching fields (majors) that had more than 200 teaching graduates each, that is elementary and special education. Evaluative follow-up questionnaires were sent during the spring of 1981 to this sample of elementary and special education majors and to the entire population of graduates from the other 39 majors. From the total population of 1386 to which questionnaires were mailed, usable completed forms were received from 694 (50%).

Table 1 presents a numerical summary of the returns by the teachers' (1) setting (rural N = 304, urban N = 153, suburban N = 224), (2) field (elementary N = 130, secondary N = 118, specialized N = 270, special education N = 176), and (3) experience (one year N = 138, two years N = 125, three year N = 153, four years N = 167, five years N = 111).

[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]

Among other comparisons, data presented in Table 1 indicate that almost twice as many BGSU graduates were teaching in rural areas than were teaching in urban areas (304 compared to 153). With respect to teaching field, there were approximately twice as many specialized (music, art, home economics, health/physical education, etc.) as there were elementary education teachers (270 versus 130). The average number of returns per each year of experience was approximately 140 -- ranging from a low of 111 for 5 years to a high of 167 for 4 years experience.

INSTRUMENTATION

The follow up evaluative questionnaire consisted of 8 sections. Data for the present study were gathered from the teachers' responses to Sections B and C.

Presented below are photo-copies of the directions, the response formats, and two illustrative items from each of the concerned sections of the questionnaire. (The other 17 competency items are presented in Table 2).

SECTION B: Your Perceived Need For and Proficiency In Selected Competencies.

Presented below are descriptions of 19 competency areas. To the right, please indicate your felt need for possessing each competency and an estimate of your classroom proficiency.

Your Ability to	Your Felt Need for this Competency (High [5] [4] Average [3] [2] Low [1])	An Estimate of Your Classroom Proficiency In This Area (High [5] [4] Average [3] [2] Low [1])
1 Teach reading in your grade or subject area	[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] (34)	[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] (35)
2 Deal with pupil behavior problems	[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] (36)	[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] (37)

SECTION C: Where Were The Proficiencies Developed?

In Section B, you noted your needs and proficiencies for 19 competency areas. We now desire you to denote which of the presented areas contributed to your perceived proficiency for each of the competencies. Merely place an "X" in the box which indicates the one area that gave you the concerned proficiency. If more than one area contributed, put "1" in the box which would denote the area that contributed most, "2" in the box which denotes second highest, etc.

	AREAS							
Your Ability to	Student Teaching	Pre Student Teaching Field Experience	Other Course Work and Experiences at BGSU	First Year Teaching Experience	Teaching Experiences After First Year	Inservice Training	Other Teachers	Supervisors and or Administrators
1 Teach reading in your grade or subject area	[ ] (72)	[ ] (73)	[ ] (74)	[ ] (75)	[ ] (76)	[ ] (77)	[ ] (78)	[ ] (79)
2 Deal with pupil behavior problems (8 _ _ _ _)	[ ] (6)	[ ] (7)	[ ] (8)	[ ] (9)	[ ] (10)	[ ] (11)	[ ] (12)	[ ] (13)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FINDINGS

TEACHERS' NEEDS AND PROFICIENCIES

Need for Each Competency. Results of the analysis of responses of the total sample of 694 teachers indicating the mean ratings and ranks for each of the nineteen competency items in terms of perceived need are presented in Table 2. Mean ratings ranged from 4.46 to 3.05.

[INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]

For the total group of respondents, the competency items ranked highest (R = 1 to 6) in need were: Deal with pupil behavior problems ($\bar{X}$ = 4.46); Motivate student achievement ($\bar{X}$ = 4.41); Work effectively with others regardless of their value system, race, religion, etc. ($\bar{X}$ = 4.29); Communicate effectively with parents regarding pupil progress ($\bar{X}$ = 4.24); Alter teaching to provide more successful instruction ($\bar{X}$ = 4.22); and Encourage and facilitate development of children's social skills and enhanced self-concepts ($\bar{X}$ = 4.21). Lowest (R = 16 to 19) need areas were: Apply the major principles of school law ($\bar{X}$ = 3.70); Teach reading in your grade or subject area ($\bar{X}$ = 3.56); Understand and utilize standardized tests ($\bar{X}$ = 3.21); and Compare, contrast, and utilize various educational philosophical viewpoints ($\bar{X}$ = 3.05).

Proficiency in Each Competency. Also shown in Table 2 are results of the analysis of responses of the total sample of teachers in terms of their perceived proficiency with respect to each competency item. Mean ratings ranged from 4.31 to 3.06.

Work effectively with others regardless of their value system, race, etc. ($\bar{X}$ = 4.31) obtained the highest proficiency rank. Other competency items for which teachers indicated a relatively high (R = 2 to 7) level of proficiency were: Prepare lesson plans and teaching units ($\bar{X}$ = 4.02); Motivate student achievement ($\bar{X}$ = 3.97); Prepare teacher made tests and evaluate/report pupil progress ($\bar{X}$ = 3.92); Encourage development of children's social skills and self-concepts ($\bar{X}$ = 3.92); Communicate effectively with parents ($\bar{X}$ = 3.85); and Deal with behavior problems ($\bar{X}$ = 3.84). Lowest proficiency rankings (R = 12 to 19) were found for the following eight competencies: Adequately guide handicapped pupils ($\bar{X}$ = 3.30); Apply principles of school law ($\bar{X}$ = 3.29); Diagnose pupil learning difficulties ($\bar{X}$ = 3.28); Understand and utilize standardized tests ($\bar{X}$ = 3.21); Teach reading in your grade or subject area ($\bar{X}$ = 3.15); Adequately challenge gifted/talented students ($\bar{X}$ = 3.12); and Compare, contrast, and utilize various philosophical viewpoints ($\bar{X}$ = 3.09).

Discrepancies between Need and Proficiency. Discrepancies

between mean ratings of need and proficiency for each of the competency items ranged from .81 to -.04. (See Table 2.)

A "very large discrepancy" between need and proficiency (D = .81) occurred for only one item: Adequately challenge your gifted/talented students--a competency which ranked low in need (R = 14) as well as proficiency (R = 18).

A "large discrepancy" was found between need and proficiency in relation to four competencies: Adequately guide handicapped pupils who have been "mainstreamed" (D = .67); Make prescriptions that more fully maximize pupil learning outcomes (D = .66); Diagnose pupil learning difficulties (D = .63); and Deal with pupil behavior problems (D = .62). Of these, only Deal with behavior problems was identified as a high need area (R = 1). This competency was also a relatively high (R = 7) proficiency area. However, the remaining "large discrepancy" items were ranked relatively low in both need (R = 12, 14.5, 14.5) and proficiency (R = 12, 13, 15).

For five competencies, there was essentially no discrepancy between need and proficiency. These included: Prepare teacher made tests and evaluate/report pupil progress (D = .10); Prepare and develop lesson plans and teaching units (D = .03); Understand and utilize standardized tests (D = .00); Work effectively with others (D = -.02); and Compare, contrast, utilize various philosophical viewpoints (D = -.04). Of these, only Work with others was ranked as a high need (R = 3) item. It was also shown to be a high proficiency item (R = 1). The competencies Develop teacher made tests/evaluate and report pupil progress as well as Prepare lesson plan/units were both perceived as moderately high need items (R = 10, 9) and relatively high proficiency items (R = 4.5, 2). However, Understand/utilize standardized tests ranked low in both need (R = 18) and proficiency(R = 16) as did Compare, contrast and utilize educational philosophical viewpoints (R = 19; R = 19).

Comparisons by Teaching Setting. Teachers' responses were also analyzed to determine if a relationship existed between teachers' perceptions of need/proficiency and teaching setting. Results of analysis of variance computations between means of urban, rural, and suburban teachers on each of the competency items yielded only one significant F ratio. (See Table 3.) This was not deemed sufficient to indicate that any such relationship may exist.

[INSERT TABLE 3 HERE]

Comparisons by Teaching Field -- Needs. Results of analysis of variance computations between means of elementary, secondary, specialized, and special education teachers yielded numerous significant F ratios for the nineteen competency items. (See Table 3.) Table 4 presents the results of post-hoc mean comparisons that were subsequently performed to identify those specific instances in which differences between pairs of

means occurred. For two competency items no significant need differences across fields was found. These items were: Select and utilize media and Prepare and develop lesson plans/teaching units.

[INSERT TABLE 4 HERE]

Overall, findings indicate that special education teachers accord a higher level of need to many of the competencies than do other teachers. In all, there were thirty instances relating to fifteen of the nineteen competencies in which mean ratings of special education teachers were higher than those of teachers in other fields. For five of the items, special education teachers perceived a higher need than did teachers in all other fields. These included: Diagnose pupil learning difficulties; Make prescriptions that more fully maximize pupil learning outcomes; Individualize instruction; Understand and utilize standardized tests; and Encourage and develop children's social skills and self-concepts. In four other areas, special education teachers' ratings of need were higher than secondary and specialized, but not elementary teachers. These were: Teach reading in the content area; Utilize evaluation of teaching performance to alter teaching and provide more successful instruction; Communicate effectively with parents; and Adequately guide handicapped pupils who are "mainstreamed." For one competency item, special education teachers reported a higher need than both elementary or secondary, but not specialized teachers: Apply the major principles of school law. For five competencies, special education teachers' need exceeded only those of secondary teachers. These were: Deal with behavior problems; Analyze and evaluate your teaching performance; Work effectively with others; Motivate student achievement; and Compare, contrast and utilize various philosophical viewpoints.

In general, findings also show that elementary teachers accord a higher level of need to many of the competencies than do secondary or specialized teachers, but not special education teachers. In fourteen instances relating to nine competency items, ratings of elementary teachers differed significantly from those of other teachers. However, for only one competency area did elementary teachers' perception of need exceed that of special education teachers: Adequately challenge gifted/talented students. For five competencies, ratings of need by elementary teachers were higher than those of both secondary and specialized teachers. These were: Teach reading; Diagnose pupil learning difficulties; Make prescriptions that more fully maximize pupil learning outcomes; Individualize instruction; and Understand and utilize standardized tests. Additionally, elementary teachers attached greater need than did secondary, but not other teachers, to: Motivate student achievement; Encourage and facilitate development of children's social skills and self-concepts; and Adequately guide handicapped pupils who are "mainstreamed."

Secondary and specialized teachers tend to be very similar

in their perceptions of need for the various competencies. In only three instances and for three competency items were mean ratings of need for secondary teachers higher than those of teachers in another field. For two competencies secondary teachers perceived a higher need than did specialized teachers: Teach reading and Prepare tests and evaluate/report pupil progress. Like elementary teachers, secondary teachers' ratings of need were higher than special education teachers' with respect to the ability to Adequately challenge gifted/talented students.

Specialized teachers' mean ratings of need were higher than those of teachers in other fields in only two instances pertaining to two competencies. When compared to secondary teachers, specialized teachers reported a greater need to Motivate student achievement. And, as did elementary and secondary teachers, when compared to special education teachers, the specialized teachers reported a higher need to Challenge gifted/talented students.

Comparison by Teaching Field -- Proficiencies. No significant differences in mean ratings for proficiency across teaching fields were obtained for four competency items. These were: Select, prepare and utilize educational media; Prepare lesson plans and units; Analyze and evaluate your teaching skills; and Utilize results to alter teaching and provide more successful instruction. For the first two items, needs also did not differ significantly across fields. However, special education teachers reported a greater need than secondary teachers to Analyze and evaluate teaching performance skills and greater need than secondary and specialized teachers to Utilize findings to alter teaching and provide more successful instruction.

As was the case with needs, special education teachers also reported higher levels of proficiency with respect to many of the competency items than did other teachers. In all, there were twenty-nine instances relating to thirteen competencies in which proficiency ratings of special education teachers were greater than those of teachers in other fields. In five competency areas, special education teachers reported having higher levels of proficiency than did teachers in all other fields. These included: Diagnose pupil learning difficulties; Make prescriptions; Individualize instruction; Communicate effectively with parents; and Adequately guide handicapped pupils who are "mainstreamed." For the first three of these competencies, their need was also perceived to be higher than that of teachers in all other fields. However, for the latter two, their need was perceived to be greater than secondary or specialized, but not elementary teachers. For three other competencies, special education teachers rated their proficiency greater than did secondary or specialized, but not elementary teachers. These were: Teach reading; Understand and utilize standardized tests; and Encourage and facilitate development of childrens' social skills and self-concepts. With respect to

teaching reading, special education teachers' perceived need was also greater than secondary and specialized, but not elementary teachers. However, for the latter two items, their ratings of need were higher than teachers in all other fields. With respect to four competencies, special education teachers' perceived proficiency exceeded only those of teachers in specialized areas. These included: Deal with behavior problems; Work effectively with others; Motivate student achievement; and Compare, contrast and utilize philosophical viewpoints. For all four of these items, special education teachers reported a need greater only than that of secondary teachers. In relation to only one competency did special education teachers indicate a higher level of proficiency than did elementary teachers: Apply the principles of school law. However, special education teachers reported a higher need for this competency than did either elementary or secondary teachers.

In general, as with needs, elementary teachers reported higher levels of proficiency for many of the competencies than did secondary or specialized teachers. In thirteen instances relating to nine competency items, mean ratings of elementary teachers were significantly different than teachers in other fields. In only one area, however, did elementary teachers indicate a higher level of proficiency than did all other teachers; Teach reading in your grade or subject area. Their need for this competency, also, was rated higher than that of secondary or specialized teachers, but not special education teachers. In one other area the perceived proficiency of elementary teachers exceeded that of special education teachers: Adequately challenge gifted/talented students. In this area elementary teachers' need also exceeded only that of special education teachers. Regarding three competency items, elementary teachers reported higher levels of proficiency than either secondary or specialized teachers. These were: Diagnose pupil learning difficulties; Make prescriptions; and Understand and utilize standardized tests. In all three of these areas the need for these competencies was also higher for elementary than for secondary or specialized teachers. In comparison to secondary teachers only did elementary teachers' perceived proficiency differ significantly for two additional competencies: Encourage and develop children's social skills and self-concepts and Adequately guide pupils who are "mainstreamed." For both of these competencies their perceptions of need were also higher than those of secondary teachers only.

Again, secondary teachers and specialized teachers were very similar in relation to level of proficiency. Secondary teachers reported greater proficiency than did teachers in all other fields for only one competency: Prepare teacher made tests and evaluate/report pupil progress. Their perceived need for this competency, however, was greater only than that of specialized teachers. For none of the nineteen competencies were the mean proficiency ratings of specialized teachers greater than those of teachers in other fields. Yet their need

was reported to be higher than that of secondary teachers to Motivate student achievement and higher than that of special education teachers to Challenge gifted/talented students.

Comparisons by Teaching Experience -- Needs. Results of analysis of variance computations between means of teachers with one, two, three, four or five years of experience indicated several significant F ratios for the nineteen competency items with respect to teaching experience. (See Table 3.)

Post-hoc pair-wise mean comparisons resulted in eleven instances relating to only seven competency items in which need differed by experience. When mean ratings of proficiency were compared, instances again relating to only seven competency items were found. (See Table 4.)

Teachers with one year of experience reported a higher level of need than those with two or three years of experience but did not differ from those with four or five years with respect to two competencies: Diagnose pupil learning difficulties and Individualize instruction. The mean need rating of teachers with one year of experience was also higher than that of teachers with two, but not different from those with more years of experience regarding the ability to Make prescriptions that more fully maximize pupil learning outcomes. For two additional competency items, teachers with one year of experience indicated a higher level need than did teachers with two or five, but did not differ from those with three or four years of experience. These were: Select, prepare and utilize education media and Use results of evaluation of teaching performance to alter teaching and provide more successful instruction. Only when compared to teachers with three years of experience were ratings of those with one year of experience higher regarding the needs: Understand and utilize standardized tests and Adequately guide handicapped pupils who are "mainstreamed."

In only two instances relating to a single competency item did more experienced teachers' perceptions of need exceed that of teachers with less experience. Teachers with four or five years of experience attached a higher level of need than did those with two, but not one or three years of experience to the ability to Diagnose pupil learning difficulties.

Comparisons by Teaching Experience -- Proficiencies. Teachers with five years of experience indicated a higher proficiency than those with one, two or three years of experience in relation to only one competency: Deal with behavior problems. However, those with five years of experience gave higher proficiency ratings than those with two years of experience to Motivate student achievement. Additionally, teachers with five years of experience rated themselves more proficient than did teachers with three years of experience in two other areas. These were: Communicate effectively with parents and Encourage development of children's social skills and self-concepts.

Interestingly, there were four instances in which teachers with only one year of experience rated their proficiency higher than did more experienced teachers. Those having only one year of experience indicated a higher level of proficiency than did those with two (but not those with three, four, or five) years of experience in three competency areas: Work effectively with others; Diagnose pupil learning difficulties, and Motivate student achievement. In one additional area, the mean proficiency rating of teachers with one year of experience exceeded only that of teachers with three years of experience; this area was: Adequately guide handicapped pupils who are "mainstreamed."

Relationship between Need and Proficiency. Finally, teachers' responses to the nineteen competency items were analyzed to determine if a relationship existed between need and proficiency. Data in Table 5 indicate that for all 694 teachers a high positive correlation between mean ratings of need and proficiency (rho = .84) was obtained.

[INSERT TABLE 5 HERE]

An examination of teachers' ratings confirmed that those competency areas for which teachers indicated a low need (i.e., teaching reading; understanding and utilizing standardized tests; comparing, contrasting and utilizing various philosophical viewpoints; and applying the principles of school law) were those which ranked low in proficiency. Conversely, those for which teachers indicated a high need (i.e., dealing with behavior problems; working with others; communicating with parents; encouraging the development of children's social skills and self-concepts; and using results of evaluation of teaching performance to alter teaching and provide more successful instruction) were those which ranked highest with respect to proficiency. Items rated moderate in need, however, were rated relatively low in proficiency in four cases, moderate in proficiency in three cases, and relatively high in proficiency in three cases. None of the items rated low in need were moderate or high proficiency items and none ranked high in need obtained high proficiency ratings.

Rather high positive correlations between need and proficiency was also found when teachers' responses were analyzed by teaching field and years of experience. However, for secondary teachers there was greater consistency between perceptions of need and proficiency (rho = .86) than for specialized (rho = .77), special education (rho = .71), or elementary (rho = .64) teachers. Furthermore, as years of experience increased, there tended to be a continuing increase (See Table 5: .73, .73, .78, .80, .82) in the consistency of need and proficiency ratings.

SOURCES OF TEACHERS' PROFICIENCY

Computation of Average Ranks and Coefficients of

Concordance. Presented in Table 6 are average ranks for the various classifications of teachers with regard to the eight possible sources of proficiencies. The arithmetic procedures for arriving at these average ranks were somewhat tedious; therefore an explanation is deemed appropriate prior to any discussion of the findings.

[INSERT TABLE 6 HERE]

First, a total "Importance Index" was computed for each classification of teachers within each of the eight proficiency source areas. This was done by (1) determining the proportion of the total subgroup N that assigned each rank, (2) multiplying each proportion by a weight factor (inverse order of the ranks) to gain an "Importance Index" for each rank, and (3) accumulating the separate "Indices" into a total for that source area and that classification of teacher. Ranks related to the total importance indices were then obtained and are reported in Table 6.

Illustrative computational examples of these procedures relating to one competency item (deal with pupil behavior problems) and one setting (rural, total N = 304) are presented below:

Two of the Eight Possible Sources for Teachers' Proficiency for Dealing with Pupil Behavior Problems

Inservice Training						First Year Teaching Experience					
Ranks	f	Proportion of N	X	Weight Factor	= Importance Index	Ranks	f	Proportion of N	X	Weight Factor	= Importance Index
1	6	.020*		8	.160	1	159	.523		8	4.184
2	6	.020		7	.140	2	45	.148		7	1.036
3	6	.020		6	.120	3	3	.010		6	.060
4	2	.007		5	.035	4	1	.003		5	.015
5	1	.003		4	.012	5	-	-		4	-
6	1	.003		3	.009	6	-	-		3	-
7	0	.000		2	.003	7	-	-		2	-
8	1	.003		1	.003	8	-	-		1	-
					.479						5.295

*6/304 = .0197 = .020

As these data show, six of the 304 rural teachers (2% or .020) ranked inservice training #1 in developing their proficiency in dealing with pupil behavior problems. By multiplying this proportion (.02) by the weight of 8, an "Importance Index" of .160 was computed for these six people. These same arithmetic procedures were then employed with the other 17 rural teachers who gave inservice training some credit for developing their management proficiencies. Resultancly, a total "Importance Index" of .479 was computed for inservice training.

For 159 of the 304 rural teachers (52.3%) first year teaching experience was ranked #1 as a source of proficiency in dealing with behavior problems. The "Importance Index" related to these 159 teachers was 4.184; the total "Index" for first year teaching experience was 5.295. This cumulative "Importance Index" of 5.295 for First Year Teaching Experience was the highest of all those computed for the rural teachers with respect to this competency. First year Teaching Experience was therefore given an overall rank of "1." The Inservice Training cumulative "Importance Index" of .479 was seventh in size and thus was given a rank of 7. A summary of computations for all settings in relation to the sources of proficiency in dealing with behavior problems is shown below:

Setting	Student Teaching	Pre-Student Teaching Field Experience	Other Course Work and Experience at BGSU	First Year Teaching Experience	Teaching Experience After First Year	Inservice Training	Other Teachers	Supervisors and/or Administrators
Rural								
(Importance Indices)	3.125	.384	.645	5.295	2.213	.479	1.009	.769
(Ranks)	2	8	6	1	3	7	4	5
Urban								
(Importance Indices)	2.995	.438	.323	5.154	1.923	.664	1.461	.884
(Ranks)	2	7	8	1	3	6	4	5
Suburban								
(Importance Indices)	2.754	.512	.163	5.382	2.419	.218	1.371	.709
(Ranks)	2	6	8	1	3	7	4	5
Average Ranks*	2	7	7.3	1	3	6.7	4	5

(*only this row of values is presented in Table 6 for Setting)

The separate and cumulative "Importance Indices" for all classifications of teachers were calculated in this same manner. The average ranks (last row of data above) are the unweighted means of the classification ranks. It should be noted that only this row of ranks, and other rows analogous to this row, are presented in Table 6.

A correlation index, Kendall's Concordance Coefficient (which indicates the amount of agreement among sets of ranks), was also computed with ranks from the three classifications of teaching setting (rural, urban, and suburban). Kendall's Concordance Coefficient summarizing the proficiency source rankings of teachers in these three settings was .96. A coefficient of this magnitude, of course, indicates very high agreement. Inspection of the above data clearly confirms this agreement in that five of the 8 sources were given the same rankings by teachers in the various settings (i.e., student teaching, all 2's; 1st year teaching, all 1's; after 1st year teaching, all 3's; other teachers, all 4's, and supervisors, all

5's). Rankings for each of the other three sources were very comparable.

These computational procedures thus exemplify those employed for each of the 19 competency items and for each of the three teacher classifications (setting, field, and experience).

Sources of Teachers' Proficiencies. Table 7 presents a summary of how all teachers (N = 694) ranked the sources of their proficiencies.

[INSERT TABLE 7 HERE]

The means presented in Table 7 were computed by summing the 19 competency item average ranks (presented in Table 6) and then dividing by 19. These arithmetic procedures produced a mean of 1.53 for first-year teaching experience. Overall, therefore, teachers credited first year teaching experience as contributing most to their noted proficiencies. Student teaching ($\bar{X}$ = 2.76) was ranked second in terms of sources of proficiency. The next two sources (Teaching Experience After First Year and Other Course Work and Experiences at BGSU) had means of 3.13 and 3.37. For all practical purposes, the means for these two are so close that these sources may be considered tied in importance.

The source area Other Teachers had a mean of 5.61 which tends not to be relatively close to those means either above or below it. The last three source areas (Pre-student Teaching Field Experience; Supervisors and/or Administrators; and Inservice Training) have means that are rather close to each other (6.03 to 6.94); thus it appears justified to regard these three source areas as equally important sources of proficiency development.

As indicated previously, mean ranks of the sources of proficiency by teaching setting, field and experience along with Kendall's Coefficients for each of the 19 competency items are shown in Table 6. The Kendall's Coefficients of Concordance indicate the extent of agreement in the rank ordering of proficiency sources by each classification of teachers.

It should be noted that Kendall's coefficients for teachers' settings and fields are comparable within and beween competency items. However, because first year teachers did not have a valid option to rank-order the source labeled "Teaching Experience After First Year" Kendall's coefficients computed on experience classifications are only comparable to other experience coefficients.

Summarized below are tabulations of the frequencies of various values of the coefficients for each of the teacher classifications:

Coefficient Values	Setting f	Field f	Experience f
.90 and higher	18	9	2
.85 - .89	1	2	1
.80 - .84	0	5	4
.75 - .79	0	0	4
.70 - .74	0	3	6
.65 - .69	0	0	1
.60 - .64	0	0	1
Number of Items	19	19	19

Comparisons of Sources by Setting. For purposes of this study it seems reasonable to assume that coefficients above .80 indicate that there are no real or practical differences in how teachers in the various settings or fields rank the sources of their proficiency. Based on this assumption, there is no evidence to indicate that the sources of teachers' noted proficiency with respect to any of the 19 competency items differ across urban, suburban, and rural settings.

Comparisons of Sources by Field. For teaching field, 16 of the 19 coefficients were higher than .80, thus again indicating that for most of the competencies no real differences exist in the sources of noted proficiency across fields. However three coefficients were between .70 and .74 and their possible implications deserve special note.

The first of these competency items (Kendall's = .71) related to the teachers' ability to teach reading. Examination of the rankings of this item by teachers in the various fields indicate that the proficiency source showing the greatest variance in assigned ranks was "Pre-student Teaching Field Experiences." Elementary teachers ranked this source 4; special education teachers gave it a rank of 3; and both other groups gave the source a 7. Student teaching and inservice training tied for producing the second highest variance in source ranks for the four groups. The average ranks assigned by each group of teachers to these two sources were:

	Sources	
Field	Student Teaching	Inservice Training
Elementary	2	7
Secondary	6	5
Specialized	4	3
Special Education	2	7

It appears therefore that secondary teachers did not receive as much help from student teaching in how to teach reading as did the other three groups and that specialized teachers received more guidance from inservice training in developing their proficiency to teach reading than did the other three groups, especially the elementary and special education teachers.

The second competency item that produced a less than .80 Kendall's agreement among the four teaching fields was: Compare, contrast and utilize various educational philosophical

viewpoints. The ranks assigned to the following three sources were most instrumental in the computation of the comparatively low Kendall's index of .72.

	Sources		
Field	Other course Work and Experience at BGSU	Teaching Experience After the First Year	Other Teachers
Elementary	1	6	2
Secondary	1	3	4
Specialized	6	2	3
Special Education	1	5	6

Specialized teachers ranked the value of Other Course Work #6; elementary, secondary, and special education teachers ranked this source #1. This disparity is somewhat difficult to explain since all BGSU teacher education majors, including specialized, are required to take EDFI 408, Philosophy of Education, which deals primarily with this competency area. Thus, it may be that the specialized teachers as a group did not perceive this course in the same positive manner as did teachers in the other three fields.

However, other differences between the rankings of the 4 groups of teachers relating to the sources of "philosophical viewpoints ... " also contributed to the low index:

1. Specialized teachers ranked for "Teaching Experience After the First-Year," as #2, while elementary teachers ranked it #6.

2. Elementary teachers ranked "Other Teachers," as source #2, whereas special education teachers ranked it #6.

Teachers' views of the sources of their ability to compare, contrast and use various educational philosophies therefore do appear to be associated with their teaching fields.

The third and final competency item associated with less than .80 Kendall's Concordance Coefficient was: Adequately guide handicapped pupils who are mainstreamed. Responses of special education teachers regarding the value of Student Teaching and Other Teachers differed appreciably from the responses of the other three groups of teachers. The special education group ranked student teaching much higher in contributing to this proficiency than did the other teachers --(rank 2 compared to 6, 7, and 5)-- and ranked the source Other Teachers much lower (3 compared to 4, 3, and 3). This may be an indication that regular teachers are afforded little opportunity during their student teaching experience to work with handicapped pupils. Also, this may reflect the general isolation of special education teachers from other teachers in their field.

Comparison of Sources by Experience. When comparing the proficiency sources of the 5 groups of teachers by experience, a disparity criterion of a Kendall's Coefficient of .70 or lower was employed to select items which have real differences in source rankings. The justification for using a lower selection criterion was the fact that first year teachers had only 7 valid options to rank (could not rank "Teaching Experience After First Year) whereas teachers with more experience had all 8 options. This tended to decrease the magnitude of the agreement coefficients and contributed to the lowering of the selection criterion from the previously used .80 to .70.

In all, three competency items were associated with coefficients of .70 or less. The first item was: After diagnosis, ... make prescriptions ... . The comparatively low Kendall's Coefficient of .67 was primarily produced by the teachers' variant ranks for the source: Teaching Experience After First Year. Teachers with one year of experience, by necessity, gave this source a rank of 8; second year teachers gave it a rank of 3; and third, fourth, and fifth year teachers gave it a rank of 1. Thus it would seem this competency is very much related to teaching experience.

The second competency item selected for special discussion was: Adequately challenge your gifted/talented students. [It is interesting to note that this item produced the only instance in which Teaching Experience After the First Year was ranked, overall, as the #1 source of teachers' proficiency. (See Table 6.)] Rankings within two proficiency source areas appear to account for the comparatively low agreement among teachers. The source, Teaching Experience After the First Year produced, again by necessity, a rank of 8 for first-year teachers, a rank of 2 for second year teachers, and a rank of 1 for third, fourth, and fifth year teachers. Inservice Training produced a rank of 6 for first year teachers and a rank of 3 for each of the other four groups of teachers. Thus while there is clear agreement across years of experience as to the primary source, teachers are apparently learning much of what they know about working with gifted students on the job.

The third and final competency item that met the ".70 or less" criterion was: Adequately guide ... mainstreamed pupils ... . The primary cause for the selection of this item was the ranking of Teaching Experience After the First Year. Teachers with one year of experience assigned this source an 8; second year teachers ranked it 2; and the third, fourth, and fifth year teachers ranked it #1. Other major contributing causes to the comparatively low Kendall's Coefficient (.63) were:

1. Inservice Training given a rank of 7 by first year teachers; a rank of 8 by second year teachers; and ranks of 5, 6, and 3 respectively by third, fourth and fifth year teachers.

2. Other Course Work and Experiences at BGSU being given a

rank of 2 by first year teachers, and ranks of 5, 3, 4, and 6 by second, third, fourth, and fifth year teachers respectively.

These variations in ranking seem to indicate that this competency may have only recently been given attention in preservice programs and, for more experienced teachers, inservice has been a more helpful contributor.

Comparisons by Need and Source. An additional analysis was undertaken to ascertain whether a relationship exists between teachers' needs for specific competencies and their sources of proficiency for these competencies. Competency items were dichotomized into two categories, above and below the median mean need. (See Table 2.) In doing so the mean need at the median was discarded and not used in this analysis. The top three proficiency sources were listed for each of the 18 remaining competency items. The 18 items distributed themselves as shown in the following 2x2 table :

		Sources of Teachers' Proficiency: 2 out of 3 Top Sources BGSU Related	2 out of 3 Top Sources Work Related (Experience)	
Teachers Need For Competency	Above Median	1	8	9
	Below Median	4	5	9
		5	13	18

Chi Square = 2.49
p=.11

There appears to be somewhat of a tendency, although not significant, for teachers to credit work experience as the primary contributing sources of their proficiency in higher need areas and for them to credit teacher training as the primary proficiency source area for lower need areas.

SUMMARY

A total of 694 1976-80 graduates of Bowling Green State University teaching in rural, urban, and suburban settings, representing elementary, secondary, specialized and special education fields, and having from one to five years of teaching experience comprised the sample for this study. Responses of these teachers to two sections of a follow-up evaluative questionnaire pertaining to teachers' needs, proficiencies and sources of proficiencies for nineteen competency items provided the data base from which the following findings were obtained.

Level of Need and Proficiency. Competencies for which teachers in general idicate highest need are:

1. Dealing with pupil behavior problems;

2. Working effectively with other teachers, specialists, administrators, students, and parents regardless of

their value systems, race, religion, age, sex, socioeconomic status, etc.

3. Communicating effectively with parents regarding student progress;

4. Utilizing findings from analyzing and evaluating teaching performance skills to alter teaching and provide more successful instruction for pupils;

5. Encouraging and facilitating the development of childrens' social skills and enhanced self-concepts.

Competencies for which teachers, in general, indicate lowest need are:

1. Applying the major principles of school law to areas such as due process, contracts, teaching liability, corporal punishment, etc.;

2. Teaching reading in grade or subject area;

3. Understanding and utilizing standardized tests;

4. Comparing, contrasting and utilizing various educational philosophical viewpoints.

Competencies for which teachers indicate highest proficiency are:

1. Working effectively with other teachers ...;

2. Preparing and developing lesson plans and teaching units;

3. Motivating student achievement via modeling, reinforcement, provision of success experiences, appeal to student interest, etc.;

4. Preparing teacher made tests and evaluating reporting pupil progress;

5. Encouraging and facilitating development of childrens' social skills and enhanced self-concepts;

6. Communicating effectively with parents regarding student progress;

7. Dealing with pupil behavior problems.

Competencies for which teachers, in general, indicate lowest proficiency are:

1. Adequately guiding handicapped pupils who have been or may be "mainstreamed;"

2. Applying the major principles of school law ... ;

3. Diagnosing pupil learning difficulties;

4. Making prescriptions of instructional strategies, educational media, and materials that more fully maximize pupil learning outcomes;

5. Understanding and utilizing standardized tests;

6. Teaching reading in grade or subject area;

7. Adequately challenging gifted/talented pupils;

8. Comparing, contrasting, and utilizing various educational philosophical viewpoints.

Discrepancies Between Need and Proficiency. Competencies for which teachers in general indicate largest discrepancies between need and proficiency are:

1. Adequately challenging gifted/talented students;

2. Dealing with pupil behavior problems;

3. Diagnosing pupil learning difficulties;

4. Making prescriptions ... that ... maximize learning outcomes;

5. Adequately guiding handicapped pupils who have been ... mainstreamed.

Competencies for which teachers in general indicate the least discrepancy between need and proficiency are:

1. Working effectively with other(s) ...;

2. Comparing, contrasting, utilizing ... philosophical viewpoints;

3. Preparing and developing lesson plans ... units;

4. Preparing teacher made tests and evalutioning/reporting pupil progress;

5. Understanding and utilizing standardized tests.

Relationship Between Need and Proficiency. For teachers in general, as well as for teachers in particular fields and with comparable years of experience, there is a high positive correlation between need and proficiency. Competencies for which teachers indicate a high need are also those competencies for which teachers report high proficiency. Conversely, those

competencies for which teachers indicate low need are those for which they report low proficiency. There is however, a somewhat higher correspondence between need and proficiency among secondary teachers than among teachers within other fields and a lower correspondence among elementary than teachers within other fields. Also, teachers with more years of experience exhibit somewhat greater congruence between need and proficiency than teachers with fewer years of experience.

Comparisons by Setting, Field, and Experience. Teachers' needs and proficiencies appear not to vary in relation to the rural, urban, or suburban nature of their teaching settings. Levels of need and proficiency, however, vary considerably by teaching fields.

Special education teachers indicate a higher need than do teachers in other fields to:

1. Diagnose pupil learning difficulties;
2. Make prescriptions that ... maximize pupil learning outcomes;
3. Individualize instruction;
4. Understand and utilize standardized tests;
5. Encourage and develop children's social skills and self-concepts.

They report higher proficiency than do other teachers to:

1. Diagnose pupil learning difficulties;
2. Make prescriptions;
3. Individualize instruction;
4. Communicate with parents regarding pupil progress;
5. Adequately guide pupils who are mainstreamed.

Elementary teachers report a higher need than do secondary or specialized teachers to:

1. Teach reading;
2. Diagnose pupil learning difficulties;
3. Make prescriptions;
4. Individualize instruction;
5. Understand and utilize standardized tests.

Also, elementary teachers consider themselves more proficient than do secondary or specialized teachers in their ability to:

1. Diagnose pupil learning difficulties;

2. Make prescriptions;

3. Understand and utilize standardized tests.

Secondary teachers consider themselves more proficient than do teachers in all other fields in the ability to:

1. Prepare tests and report/evaluate pupil progress.

They also indicate a higher need than specialized teachers to:

1. Teach reading;

2. Prepare tests and report/evaluate pupil progress.

Specialized teachers indicate a greater need than secondary teachers to:

1. Motivate student achievement.

Not surprisingly, teachers in elementary, secondary and specialized fields all indicate a greater need and a higher proficiency than special education teachers to:

1. Adequately challenge gifted/talented students.

For two competencies there appears to be little variation in level of need by teaching field:

1. Select, prepare and utilize media;

2. Prepare and develop lesson plans and teaching units.

In terms of proficiency, little or no variation by field appears to exist in teachers' ability to:

1. Select, prepare, and utilize media ... ;

2. Analyze and evaluate teaching performance skills;

3. ... alter teaching to provide more successful instruction.

Although some variations in level of need and proficiency appear to be associated with years of experience, teachers' perceptions of level of need and extent of proficiency tend to remain relatively stable over time. That is, teachers with more experience are very comparable to less experienced teacher with

respect to their perceived need for and proficiency in most of the nineteen competencies. There is however, a general trend for the relationship between need and proficiency to become somewhat greater with successive years of teaching. Nonetheless, there is only one competency for which there is a very definite and continuous increase in proficiency associated with additional teaching experience -- this occurs just in the ability to deal with pupil behavior problems.

Sources of Teacher Proficiency. Teachers in general consider their first year of teaching to be the major contributor to their teaching proficiency. Ranked second is student teaching. Teaching experience after the first year and other coursework and experiences are near equal contributors and rank third. Next in importance are other teachers. The remaining sources are nearly comparable in perceived value and contribute least: pre-student teaching experience, supervisors and/or administrators, and inservice training.

Comparisons of Sources by Setting, Field and Experience. As was the case with respect to need and proficiency, teachers in rural, urban, and suburban settings appear not to differ with respect to those sources which contribute most, moderately, and least to their proficiency.

For most of the competencies there also appears to be little variation in sources of proficiency across teaching fields. There are three competencies, however, for which notable variations appear to exist. Regarding their ability to teach reading, both elementary and special education teachers consider pre-student teaching field experiences as a more important contributor than do either secondary or specialized teachers. Furthermore, with respect to this competency, student teaching is a less important source of proficiency for secondary teachers than for teachers in other fields. Additionally, specialized teachers attribute more importance to inservice training in developing this proficiency than do other teachers.

A marked variation also exists with respect to the ability to compare, contrast, and utilize various educational philosophical viewpoints. Elementary, secondary, and special education teachers attribute their proficiency in this area primarily to Other Coursework and Experiences. However, specialized teachers rank this source low and give higher credit to Teaching Experience After the First Year and to Other Teachers.

Finally, in developing their proficiency for guiding handicapped pupils who are mainstreamed, special education teachers rank student teaching considerably higher than do other teachers. Concurrently, special education teachers consider Other Teachers as a much less important source for this competency than do teachers in other fields.

Sources of teachers' proficiencies also vary little in

relation to years of teaching experience. However, for three of the nineteen competencies there are notable variations in source rankings between teachers with one and teachers with more years of experience. For these competencies -- Make prescriptions, Challenge gifted/talented students, and Guide handicapped pupils who are mainstreamed -- teachers with more than one year of experience consistently rank Teaching Experience After the First Year as a major contributor. Also, more experienced teachers accord Inservice training greater importance in developing proficiency in the latter two areas. Thus, it appears that as teachers continue teaching, these sources become major contributors to proficiency in these areas.

IMPLICATIONS

It is recognized that the sample used for purposes of this investigation may not be representative of teachers in general. Also, needs and proficiencies as addressed in this study are associated with a set of general competencies which reflect stipulated objectives of teacher education coursework at BGSU. The study must, therefore, be regarded as heuristic and the following implications viewed as tentative. Both operational and constructive replications of the study are necessary prior to the formulation of generalizable conclusions.

First, although there is considerable evidence to indicate that effective schools are those in which teachers are skilled in monitoring student progress, diagnosing student learning difficulties, and accommodating for student differences through utilization of a variety of instructional strategies, findings of this study imply that these are not the competencies for which practicing teachers indicate a high need or develop a high proficiency. Rather, results of this study suggest that teachers' major priorities --- and their highest proficiencies --- at the end of their first year of teaching and continuing with successive years of experience are not instructional skills per se. Rather, they are abilities which might more appropriately be classified as interpersonal or human relations skills. It is these competencies, apparently, which are continuously emphasized and reinforced within the demands of the work setting. Instructional skills are deemed less important and are also skills in which teachers appear to be less proficient.

Secondly, many policies and practices pertaining to the preparation of teachers have been based upon the assumption that different teaching settings call for different teaching competencies. For example, the Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers in Ohio mandate that all prospective teachers have urban and suburban or rural experiences. Findings presented in this study raise a question as to whether there is a relationship between settings and the competencies teachers need, the proficiencies they develop, and the sources of their proficiencies.

Third, much concern has been expressed among teacher educators regarding the lack of any common body of professional knowledge, beliefs and practices which characterize teaching as a profession. Clearly demonstrated by this study are significant differences by teaching field in teachers' need and proficiency in certain of the competencies investigated. Whether these are differences which should or should not exist is a question beyond the realm of this paper. However, if these differences do exist, that question must be answered prior to determining what constitutes effective changes in either the preservice preparation or inservice development of teachers.

The last and perhaps most provocative of the implications to be drawn arises from findings pertaining to the critical nature of the first year of teaching in determining teachers' proficiencies. In contrast to what might have been expected, additional years of teaching experience or other school-related variables (e.g. as other teachers, administrators, and inservice training) appear not to alter teachers' priorities or significantly increase their perceived proficiency. These findings may, of course, be attributable to the lack of sensitivity of the instrument in detecting real differences. Or, perceptions may not be reality but only percentages of reality; thus teachers' responses may reflect only 80, 60, 40 or some smaller percentage of their "real" need and proficiency. However, if teachers' needs and proficiences do remain relatively constant over successive years of experience, then the first year of teaching must be viewed as the most crucial year in teacher preparation. Furthermore, if there are few real differences between the proficiencies of less experienced and more experienced teachers, preservice preparation accounts for a much greater proportion of teacher competency than it is often attributed. Finally, the similarity in proficiency between experienced and less experienced teachers points to a need to give concerted attention to ways of promoting the ongoing professional development of teachers. For if teacher efficacy is an important contributor to school effectiveness, the lack of growth in teachers' perceptions of their proficiency would appear to have serious ramifications with respect to the problem of school renewal and improvement.

References

Blair, C.W. "Classroom Teachers' Perceptions of Preservice Education Related to Teaching the Handicapped." Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 34, No. 2, 1983, 52-54.

Borich, G.D. Three Models for Conducting Follow-up Studies of Teacher Education and Training. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1979.

Educating a Profession: Competency Assessment. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, April, 1983.

Feistreitzer, C.E. The Making of a Teacher: A Report on Teacher Education and Certification. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Information, 1984.

Goodlad, J.I. A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Hord, S.M. and Hall, G.E. (Editors). Teacher Education Program Evaluation and Follow-up Studies: A Collection of Current Efforts. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The Universityof Texas, 1979.

Hord, S.M., Savage, T.V., and Bethel, L.J. (Editors). Toward Useable Strategies for Teacher Education Program Evaluations. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1982.

Joyce, B.R., Hersh, R.H., and McKibbin, M. The Structure of School Improvement. New York: Longman, Inc., 1983.

Katz, L., Raths, J., Mahanty, C., Kurachi, A. and Irving, J. "Follow-up Studies: Are They Worth the Trouble?" Journal of Teacher Education (March-April 1981), 18-24.

Medley, D.M. "Teacher Effectiveness." in Encyclopedia of Education Research. H.E. Mitzel (Editor). New York: The Free Press, 1982, 1894-1903.

"Pre-Conference Reports." AACTE/ISU Sponsored Conference on Student Assessment. Normal, Illinois, July 9-10, 1984.

The Nation Responds. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1984.

Queen, J.A. and Gretes, J.A. "First-Year Teachers' Perceptions of Their Preservice Training," Phi Delta Kappan (November, 1982), 215-16.

Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accrediation of Teacher Education, 1982.

Teacher Education Policy in the States: 50-State Survey of Legislative and Administrative Actions. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1985.

Table 1

The Classifications and Number of Teachers Within Each

Setting	N	Field	N	Experience	N
Urban	153	Elementary	130	1 Yr Experience	138
Rural	304	Secondary	118	2 Yrs Experience	125
Suburban	224	Specialized	270	3 Yrs Experience	153
	681	Special Educ	176	4 Yrs Experience	167
			694	5 Yrs Experience	111
					694

Table 2

Means, Ranks, and Mean Discrepancies of the Teachers' Needs and Proficiencies (N = 694)

Competency Item	Mean Need	Rank	Mean Prof	Rank	Discrepancy Need X-Prof X	Rank of Discrepancy	Description of the Discrepancy*
1. Teach reading in your grade or subject area.	3.56	17	3.15	17	.41	9.5	Small
2. Deal with pupil behavior problems.	4.46	1	3.84	7	.62	5	Large
3. Select, prepare, and effectively utilize educational media.	3.98	11	3.63	10	.35	13	Small
4. Analyze and evaluate your teaching performance skills.	4.09	7	3.69	9	.40	11	Small
5. Utilize the findings from #4 above in altering your teaching and providing more successful instruction for your pupils.	4.22	5	3.71	8	.51	6	Moderate
6. Diagnose pupil learning difficulties (via testing instruments, observational techniques, etc.).	3.91	15	3.28	14.5	.63	4	Large
7. (After diagnosis) ... make prescriptions of instructional strategies, educational media, and materials that more fully maximize pupil learning outcomes.	3.94	13	3.28	14.5	.66	3	Large
8. Work effectively with other teachers, specialists, administrators, students, and parents, regardless of their value systems, race, religion, age, sex, socioeconomic status, etc.	4.29	3	4.31	1	-.02	18	None
9. Motivate student achievement via modeling, reinforcement, provision of success experiences, appeal to student interests, etc.	4.41	2	3.97	3	.44	8	Small
10. Individualize instruction to meet the varying needs of students, via techniques such as mastery learning, alternative assignments, individual contracting, group and individual work, etc.	4.07	8	3.60	11	.47	7	Moderate
11. Prepare and develop lesson plans and teaching units.	4.05	9	4.02	2	.03	16	None
12. Prepare teacher made tests and evaluate/report pupil progress.	4.02	10	3.92	4.5	.10	15	None
13. Understand and utilize standardized tests.	3.21	18	3.21	16	.00	17	None
14. Communicate effectively with parents regarding student progress.	4.24	4	3.85	6	.39	12	Small
15. Compare, contrast and utilize various educational philosophical viewpoints.	3.85	19	3.89	19	-.04	19	None
16. Encourage and facilitate the development of children's social skills and enhanced self-concepts.	4.21	6	3.92	4.5	.29	14	Small
17. Apply the major principles of school law to areas such as due process, contracts, teaching liability, corporal punishment, etc.	3.78	16	3.29	13	.41	9.5	Small
18. Adequately challenge your gifted/talented students.	3.93	14	3.12	18	.81	1	Very Large
19. Adequately guide handicapped pupils who have been or may be "mainstreamed" into your classroom.	3.97	12	3.30	12	.67	2	Large

*Discrepancy differences were classified as follows:

.81	Very Large Discrepancy	# of Items 1
.62 to .67	Large Discrepancy	# of Items 4
.47 to .51	Moderate Discrepancy	# of Items 2
.29 to .44	Small Discrepancy	# of Items 7
-.04 to .18	Essentially no Discrepancy	# of Items 5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3
Analysis of Teachers' Needs and Proficiencies
--By Teaching Setting, Field, and Experience

Competency Item Your ability to:		ANOVA F's Between Means of (1) Urban (2) Rural, and (3) Suburban Teachers		ANOVA F's Between Means of (1) Elementary, (2) Secondary, (3) Specialized, and (4) Special Ed Teachers		ANOVA F's Between Means of Teachers With 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 years Experience	
		F	p	F	p	F	p
1. Teach reading in your grade or subject area.	Need	.76	.47	90.73	.00	.94	.44
	Proficiency	1.96	.14	32.12	.00	1.72	.14
2. Deal with pupil behavior problems.	Need	.57	.57	3.73	.01	1.54	.19
	Proficiency	3.10	.05	3.11	.03	5.34	.00
3. Select, prepare, and effectively utilize educational media.	Need	.07	.93	2.31	.07	3.94	.00
	Proficiency	.30	.74	.82	.48	1.06	.37
4. Analyze and evaluate your teaching performance skills.	Need	.23	.79	4.55	.00	2.96	.02
	Proficiency	.31	.74	1.64	.18	2.45	.05
5. Utilize the findings from #4 above in altering your teaching and providing more successful instruction for your pupils.	Need	.09	.92	6.65	.00	4.50	.00
	Proficiency	1.01	.37	4.06	.01	1.66	.16
6. Diagnose pupil learning difficulties (via testing instruments, observational techniques, etc.).	Need	.41	.66	61.75	.00	7.63	.00
	Proficiency	.02	.98	62.52	.00	3.98	.00
7. (After diagnosis) ... make prescriptions of instructional strategies, educational media, and materials that more fully maximize pupil learning outcomes.	Need	.56	.57	58.31	.00	5.16	.00
	Proficiency	.53	.59	46.77	.00	2.98	.02
8. Work effectively with other teachers, specialists, administrators, students, and parents, regardless of their value systems, race, religion, age, sex, socioeconomic status, etc.	Need	.63	.53	3.51	.02	1.50	.20
	Proficiency	.38	.68	3.67	.01	4.20	.00
9. Motivate student achievement via modeling, reinforcement, provision of success experiences, appeal to student interests, etc.	Need	.59	.55	8.46	.00	1.17	.32
	Proficiency	1.35	.26	7.28	.00	3.99	.00

Table 3 (continued)

Competency Item Your ability to:		(1) Urban (2) Rural, and (3) Suburban Teachers		(1) Elementary, (2) Secondary, (3) Specialized, and (4) Special Ed Teachers		Teachers With 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 years Experience	
		F	p	F	p	F	p
10. Individualize instruction to meet the varying needs of students, via techniques such as mastery learning, alternative assignments, individual contracting, group and individual work, etc.	Need	.32	.72	31.34	.00	4.34	.00
	Proficiency	.50	.61	39.55	.00	2.87	.02
11. Prepare and develop lesson plans and teaching units.	Need	1.02	.36	2.50	.06	.86	.49
	Proficiency	1.62	.20	.24	.87	.80	.53
12. Prepare teacher made tests and evaluate/report pupil progress.	Need	.09	.91	4.44	.00	1.34	.25
	Proficiency	.37	.69	6.60	.00	.46	.75
13. Understand and utilize standardized tests.	Need	1.24	.29	42.10	.00	3.24	.01
	Proficiency	.38	.68	31.22	.00	1.38	.24
14. Communicate effectively with parents regarding student progress.	Need	.10	.91	15.22	.00	1.17	.32
	Proficiency	2.19	.11	14.23	.00	2.87	.02
15. Compare, contrast and utilize various educational philosophical viewpoints.	Need	.18	.84	3.29	.02	1.06	.38
	Proficiency	.05	.95	4.23	.01	.78	.54
16. Encourage and facilitate the development of children's social skills and enhanced self-concepts.	Need	.49	.61	13.34	.00	2.95	.02
	Proficiency	1.70	.18	10.03	.00	4.78	.00
17. Apply the major principles of school law to areas such as due process, contracts, teaching liability, corporal punishment, etc.	Need	.05	.95	5.64	.00	2.62	.03
	Proficiency	.44	.65	4.36	.00	1.59	.18
18. Adequately challenge your gifted/talented students.	Need	2.39	.09	11.46	.00	1.23	.29
	Proficiency	2.03	.13	6.47	.00	1.26	.28
19. Adequately guide handicapped pupils who have been or may be "mainstreamed" into your classroom.	Need	1.64	.19	13.50	.00	3.04	.02
	Proficiency	.67	.51	55.21	.00	3.34	.01

Table 4
Post-Hoc Pair-Wise Mean Comparisons (Scheffe @.05)
Relating to Significant ANOVA F-Ratios

Significant Comparisons

Needs	# of Instances	Item(s)
Elem $\bar{X}$ > Secondary $\bar{X}$	8	1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 16, 19
Elem $\bar{X}$ > Specialized $\bar{X}$	5	1, 6, 7, 10, 13
Elem $\bar{X}$ > Spec Ed $\bar{X}$	1	18
Secondary $\bar{X}$ > Specialized $\bar{X}$	2	1, 12
Secondary $\bar{X}$ > Special Ed $\bar{X}$	1	18
Specialized $\bar{X}$ > Secondary $\bar{X}$	1	9
Specialized $\bar{X}$ > Spec Ed $\bar{X}$	1	18
Special Ed $\bar{X}$ > Elem $\bar{X}$	6	6, 7, 10, 13, 16, 17
Special Ed $\bar{X}$ > Secondary $\bar{X}$	15	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19
Spec Ed $\bar{X}$ > Specialized $\bar{X}$	9	1, 5, 6, 7, 10, 13, 14, 16, 19
Year 1 $\bar{X}$ > year 2 $\bar{X}$	5	3, 5, 6, 7, 10
Year 1 $\bar{X}$ > year 3 $\bar{X}$	3	6, 10, 13
Year 1 $\bar{X}$ > year 4 $\bar{X}$	1	19
Year 1 $\bar{X}$ > year 5 $\bar{X}$	2	3, 5
Year 4 $\bar{X}$ > year 2 $\bar{X}$	1	6
Year 5 $\bar{X}$ > year 2 $\bar{X}$	1	6

Proficiencies

Elem $\bar{X}$ > Secondary $\bar{X}$	7	1, 6, 7, 9, 13, 16, 19
Elem $\bar{X}$ > Specialized $\bar{X}$	4	1, 6, 7, 13
Elem $\bar{X}$ > Special Educ $\bar{X}$	2	1, 18
Secondary $\bar{X}$ > Elem $\bar{X}$	1	12
Secondary $\bar{X}$ > Specialized $\bar{X}$	1	12
Secondary $\bar{X}$ > Spec Educ $\bar{X}$	1	12
Special Ed $\bar{X}$ > Elem $\bar{X}$	6	6, 7, 10, 14, 17, 19
Special Ed $\bar{X}$ > Secondary $\bar{X}$	12	1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19
Spec Ed $\bar{X}$ > Specialized $\bar{X}$	11	1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19
Year 5 $\bar{X}$ > Year 1 $\bar{X}$	1	2
Year 5 $\bar{X}$ > Year 2 $\bar{X}$	2	2, 9
Year 5 $\bar{X}$ > Year 3 $\bar{X}$	3	2, 14, 16
Year 1 $\bar{X}$ > Year 2 $\bar{X}$	3	6, 8, 9
Year 1 $\bar{X}$ > Year 3 $\bar{X}$	1	19

Table 5

Correlations between teachers' need and proficiency rankings by teaching field and experience.

Experience	Spearman Rho
1 year	.73
2 years	.73
3 years	.78
4 years	.80
5 years	.82
Field	
Elementary	.64
Secondary	.86
Specialized	.77
Special Education	.71
Total (all 694 teachers)	.84

Table 6
Analysis of the Sources of Teachers' Proficiencies--By Teaching Setting, Field, and Experience

Competency Items and Teacher Classification	Ranks of Sources of Proficiencies: Student Teaching	Pre-Student Teaching Field Experience	Other Course Work and Experience at BGSU	First Year Teaching Experience	Teaching Experience After First Year	Inservice Training	Other Teachers	Supervisors and/or Administrators	Extent of Agreement Within Classifications Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance
Item 1. Teach reading in your grade or subject area.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	3	5.3	2	1	4	7	5.7	8	.99
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized, & Special Education Teachers	3.5	5.3	3.3	1	4	5.5	5.5	8	.71
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	3	5.2	2.4	1	4.8	6.4	5.4	7.8	.83
Sum	10.5	15.8	7.7	3	12.8	19.9	16.6	23.8	
Ranks	3	5	2	1	4	7	6	8	
Item 2. Deal with pupil behavior problems.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	2	7	7.3	1	3	6.7	4	5	.96
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized, & Special Education Teachers	2	6.8	7	1	3	6.8	4	5.8	.90
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	2.6	6.6	6.4	1	3.4	6.6	4	5.4	.73
Sum	6.6	20.4	20.7	3	9.4	20.1	12	16.2	
Ranks	2	7	8	1	3	6	4	5	
Item 3. Select, prepare, and effectively utilize educational media.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	2	4.7	2.3	1.7	4.3	7	6	8	.95
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized, & Special Education Teachers	1.5	5	2.5	2	4.5	6.5	6	8	.90
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	1.4	4.6	2.8	1.8	4.6	6.8	6	7.8	.88
Sum	4.9	14.3	7.6	5.5	13.4	20.3	18	23.8	
Ranks	1	5	3	2	4	7	6	8	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6 (continued)
Analysis of the Sources of Teachers' Proficiencies--By Teaching Setting, Field, and Experience

Competency Items and Teacher Classification	Ranks of Sources of Proficiencies: Student Teaching	Pre-Student Teaching Field Experience	Other Course Work and Experience at BGSU	First Year Teaching Experience	Teaching Experience After First Year	Inservice Training	Other Teachers	Supervisors and/or Administrators	Extent of Agreement Within Classifications Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance
Item 4. Analyze and evaluate your teaching performance skills.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	1	5.7	5.3	2	4	7.7	7.3	3	.98
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized & Special Education Teachers	1	5.8	5.5	2	4	7.5	7	3.3	.91
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience.	1	5.4	5	2.2	4.2	7.6	7	3.6	.84
Sums	3.0	16.9	15.8	6.2	12.2	22.8	21.3	9.9	
Ranks	1	6	5	2	4	8	7	3	
Item 5. Utilize the findings from #4 above in altering your teaching and providing more successful instruction for your pupils.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	2	6	4.7	1	3	7.7	6.7	5	.90
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized & Special Education Teachers	2.8	5.8	5	1	2.3	7.3	6.8	5.3	.84
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	2.6	6.4	4.8	1.4	2.8	7.2	6.4	4.4	.73
Sums	7.4	18.2	14.5	3.4	8.1	22.2	19.9	14.7	
Ranks	2	6	4	1	3	8	7	5	
Item 6. Diagnose pupil learning difficulties (via testing instruments, observational techniques, etc.).									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	3.7	5.7	2	1	3.3	7	5.7	7.7	.94
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized & Special Education Teachers	3.8	5.8	2.3	1.3	3	6	6.5	7.5	.84
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	3.4	6.2	2.4	1.4	3.8	6.6	4.8	7.4	.75
Sums	10.9	17.7	6.7	3.7	10.1	19.6	17.0	22.6	
Ranks	4	6	2	1	3	7	5	8	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6 (continued)
Analysis of the Sources of Teachers' Proficiencies--By Teaching Setting, Field, and Experience

Competency Items and Teacher Classification	Ranks of Sources of Proficiencies: Student Teaching	Pre-Student Teaching Field Experience	Other Course Work and Experience at BGSU	First Year Teaching Experience	Teaching Experience After First Year	Inservice Training	Other Teachers	Supervisors and/or Administrators	Extent of Agreement Within Classifications: Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance
Item 7. (After diagnosis) ... make prescriptions of instructional strategies, educational media, and materials that more fully maximize pupil learning outcomes.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	4	7.3	3.3	1	2.3	6.7	4.3	7	.89
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized & Special Education Teachers	4.8	6.5	3.3	1.3	2	4.5	4.5	6.5	.81
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	4	6.2	2.8	1.6	2.8	6.8	5	6.8	.67
Sums	12.8	20.0	9.4	3.9	7.1	18.0	13.8	20.3	
Ranks	4	7	3	1	2	6	5	8	
Item 8. Work effectively with other teachers, specialists, administrators, students, and parents, regardless of their value systems, race, religion, age, sex, socioeconomic status, etc.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	2	4	6.3	1	3	8	5	6.7	.98
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized & Special Education Teachers	2.3	4.5	6	1	2.8	8	5	6.5	.93
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	2.6	4.8	5.8	1	3.4	8	4.8	5.6	.77
Sums	6.9	13.3	18.1	3.0	9.2	2.4	14.8	18.8	
Ranks	2	4	6	1	3	8	5	7	
Item 9. Motivate student achievement via modeling, reinforcement, provision of success experiences, appeal to student interests, etc.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	2	5	4	1	3	7	6	8	1.00
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized & Special Education teachers	2.3	5.5	4.3	1	2.8	6.5	5.8	8	.93
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	2.2	5.2	3.8	1.4	3.6	6.2	6	7.6	.75
Sums	6.5	15.7	12.1	3.4	9.4	19.7	17.8	23.6	
Ranks	2	5	4	1	3	7	6	8	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6 (continued)
Analysis of the Sources of Teachers' Proficiencies--By
Teaching Setting, Field, and Experience

Competency Items and Teacher Classification	Ranks of Sources of Proficiencies								Extent of Agreement Within Classifications
	Student Teaching	Pre-Student Teaching Field Experience	Other Course Work and Experience at BGSU	First Year Teaching Experience	Teaching Experience After First Year	Inservice Training	Other Teachers	Supervisors and/or Administrators	Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance
Item 10. Individualize instruction to meet the varying needs of students, via techniques such as mastery learning, alternative assignments, individual contracting, group and individual work, etc.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	2.3	5.7	3.3	1	3.3	6.7	5.7	8	.95
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized, & Special Education Teachers	3.3	5.8	3	1.3	2.8	6.8	5.5	7.8	.85
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	3	5.2	3.2	1.4	3	6.6	6	7.6	.78
Sums	8.6	16.7	9.5	3.7	9.1	20.1	17.2	23.4	
Ranks	2	6	4	1	3	7	5	8	
Item 11. Prepare and develop lesson plans and teaching units.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	1	3.7	2.7	2.7	5	8	6	7	.97
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized, & Special Education Teachers	1	3.3	2.8	3.3	4.8	8	6.3	6.8	.93
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	1	4	2	3.2	5.2	8	6.2	6.4	.94
Sums	3	11.0	7.5	9.2	15.0	24.0	18.5	20.2	
Ranks	1	4	2	3	5	8	6	7	
Item 12. Prepare teacher made tests and evaluate/report pupil progress.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	1.7	5	2	2.3	4	7	6.3	7.6	.93
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized, & Special Education Teachers	1.8	5.3	2	2.3	4	7.3	6.3	7.3	.90
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	1.6	4.6	2.2	2.2	4.6	7.2	6.2	7.4	.90
Sums	5.1	14.9	6.2	6.8	12.6	21.5	18.8	22.3	
Ranks	1	5	2	3	4	7	6	8	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6 (continued)
Analysis of the Sources of Teachers' Proficiencies--By Teaching Setting, Field, and Experience

Competency Items and Teacher Classification	Ranks of Sources of Proficiencies								Extent of Agreement Within Classifications Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance
	Student Teaching	Pre-Student Teaching Field Experience	Other Course Work and Experience at BGSU	First Year Teaching Experience	Teaching Experience After First Year	Inservice Training	Other Teachers	Supervisors and/or Administrators	
Item 13. Understand and utilize standardized tests.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	3	5	1	2	4	7.3	6.7	3	.96
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized, & Special Education Teachers	3	5.8	1	2.3	4	6.8	7	6.3	.85
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	3.4	5.2	1	2.2	4.6	7.6	5.8	6.2	.80
Sums	9.4	16.0	3	6.5	12.6	21.7	19.5	15.5	
Ranks	3	6	1	2	4	8	7	5	
Item 14. Communicate effectively with parents regarding student progress.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	3.3	7.3	5.7	1	2	7.7	5	4	.95
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized, & Special Education Teachers	3.5	6.8	5.3	1	2	7.3	5	5.3	.80
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	3.2	7	6.2	1.2	2.8	7	4.2	4.4	.74
Sums	10.0	21.1	17.2	3.2	6.8	22.0	14.2	13.3	
Ranks	3	7	6	1	2	8	5	4	
Item 15. Compare, contrast and utilize various educational philosophical viewpoints.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	4	5.7	1	2.3	3.3	7.3	4.7	7.7	.90
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized, & Special Education Teachers	4.3	4.8	2.3	2	4	7.8	4.3	7.3	.72
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	3.8	5.4	1	2.8	5.2	7.2	3.8	6.8	.71
Sums	12.1	15.9	4.3	7.1	12.5	22.3	12.8	21.8	
Ranks	3	6	1	2	4	8	5	7	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6 (continued)
Analysis of the Sources of Teachers' Proficiencies--By Teaching Setting, Field, and Experience

Competency Items and Teacher Classification	Ranks of Sources of Proficiencies: Student Teaching	Pre-Student Teaching Field Experience	Other Course Work and Experience at BGSU	First Year Teaching Experience	Teaching Experience After First Year	Inservice Training	Other Teachers	Supervisors and/or Administrators	Extent of Agreement Within Classifications: Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance
Item 16. Encourage and facilitate the development of children's social skills and enhanced self-concepts.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	2.7	6	4	1	2.3	5.7	6.3	8	.95
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized, & Special Education Teachers	2.5	6.5	4	1	2.5	6	5.8	7.8	.93
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	2.6	5.6	3.8	1.2	3	5.8	6	8	.82
Sums	7.8	18.1	11.8	3.2	7.8	17.5	18.1	23.8	
Ranks	2.5	6.5	4	1	2.5	5	6.5	8	
Item 17. Apply the major principles of school law to areas such as due process, contracts, teaching liability, corporal punishment, etc.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	6.3	8	1.7	1.3	3.7	6.3	5.3	3.3	.95
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized, & Special Education Teachers	6.3	8	1.3	1.8	3	6.3	5.5	4	.95
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	6	7.6	1.8	2.2	3.4	6.4	5	3.4	.71
Sums	18.6	23.6	4.8	5.3	10.1	19.0	15.8	10.7	
Ranks	6	8	1	2	3	7	5	4	
Item 18. Adequately challenge your gifted/talented students.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	4.7	7.3	3.3	1.7	1.3	4	6	7.7	.95
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized, & Special Education Teachers	5	7.3	3.3	2	1.5	4	5.5	7.5	.83
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	4.6	7.2	4.4	1.6	2.4	3.6	4.8	7.4	.70
Sums	14.3	21.8	11.0	5.3	5.2	11.6	16.3	22.6	
Ranks	5	7	3	2	1	4	6	8	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6
Analysis of the Sources of Teachers' Proficiencies--By Teaching Setting, Field, and Experience

Competency Items and Teacher Classification	Ranks of Sources of Proficiencies: Student Teaching	Pre-Student Teaching Field Experience	Other Course Work and Experience at BGSU	First Year Teaching Experience	Teaching Experience After First Year	Inservice Training	Other Teachers	Supervisors and/or Administrators	Extent of Agreement Within Classifications: Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance
Item 19. Adequately guide handicapped pupils who have been or may be "mainstreamed" into your classroom.									
1. Rural, urban, and suburban teachers	4.7	7.7	3	1	2	5.3	5	7.3	.95
2. Elementary, Secondary, Specialized, & Special Education Teachers	5	7	3.8	1.3	2	5.5	4.5	7	.74
3. Teachers with 1,2,3,4, or 5 years experience	4.6	7	4	1.6	2.6	5.8	3.6	6.8	.63
Sums	14.3	21.7	10.8	3.9	6.6	16.6	13.1	21.1	
Ranks	5	8	3	1	2	6	4	7	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7
Summary of How All Teachers Ranked the
Sources of Their Proficiencies (N = 694)

Mean Rank*	Rank	Source
1.53	1	First-year teaching experience
2.76	2	Student Teaching
3.13	3	Teaching experience after first year
3.37	4	Other course work and experience at BGSU
5.61	5	Other teachers
6.03	6	Pre-student teaching field experiences
6.63	7	Supervisors and/or administrators
6.94	8	Inservice training

*Per source, sum of the 19 average ranks (last row per competency item in Table 6) divided by 19.